

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-3, 5-20, 92-93, 95-96, 100-101, 104-120, 123-134, 136-138 and 140-162. Claims 1, 14, 16, 123-130 and 136-138 were amended. Claims 140-162 are new. Claims 21, 89 - 91, 94, 97 - 99, 102-103, 121-122 and 139 were cancelled.

Claim 140 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names".

Claim 140 was amended to require determining a plurality of page addresses responsive to the entered information and selecting a unique page address from the plurality of determined page addresses. This is not taught or suggested by Osaku. The Examiner related to Fig. 12, items 248, 258 and 260, of Osaku, as disclosing that the provided page is selected from multiple matching sites. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Fig. 12 of Osaku, item 248 illustrates sending the entered information "888" to a translator identified by the address www.hatchUSA.com. The response provided by the translator is the single address www.hatch.co.jp, which appears in items 258 and 260. Thus, this example represents the teachings of Osaku which does not perform an act of determining a plurality of page addresses, responsive to the entered information, but rather provides a single matching address. Furthermore, as shown in block 424 of Fig. 23 of Osaku, when a single match is not found, a "not found" message is returned.

The other amendments to claim 140 were made to clarify the claim and remove limitations not required for patentability. For example, the term "software" was replaced by the more general and more descriptive term "translator". The requirement for typing was removed in order to encompass other methods of entering information, such as voice recognition.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating claim 122 as being allowable. Accordingly, claims 121 and 122 were cancelled and their limitations were incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 includes subject matter that the Examiner indicated is allowable. Claims 123-126 and 128-130 were amended so that they depend on claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 121. Claim 127 was amended to depend on claim 1 instead of on claim 126. Claim 126 was also amended to remove the term "only", which may have made the claim ambiguous. The claims depending on claim 1 are patentable at least by the virtue of their parent claim.

Claims 136-138 stand rejected for lack of antecedent. Claims 136-138 were amended following the Examiner's suggestion.

Claims 14-15, 92 and 101, 113, 137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names".

Claim 14 was amended to emphasize that the user dependent information is not the entered information. This was implicit in the claim and is made explicit for clarity. Claim 14 was also amended to state that the user dependent information is not entered in the same session as the entered information and is provided to the software along with the entered information.

Claim 14 requires providing the entered information to a software not associated with the site, along with user-dependent information not entered by the user in a session in which the information is entered and analyzing the information using user dependent information, other than the entered information and providing a page address responsive to the analysis.

The only information provided by the user in Osaku is the simplified network address (SNA) 22 (col. 5, lines 12-24), which corresponds to the entered information of claim 14 and is not user dependent information, other than the entered information.

Claims 16-18, 93, 96 and 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al. (U.S. patent 6,061,738) in view of "Internationalization of Domain names".

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and states that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* rejection, as the Examiner has not shown at least one limitation of claim 16.

Claim 16 was amended to clarify the claim and specifically state an act of determining a geographical location instead of the implicit statement of analyzing the information responsive to a geographical location. If this amendment changes the scope of the claim it broadens the claim, as it removes the analysis requirement. In addition, the claim was amended to remove the requirement that the location is the location at which the information is entered. This amendment also broadens the claim, such that amended claim 16 was broadened and not narrowed.

Claim 16, as amended, requires determining to a geographical location and providing a page address of a page of said site, responsive to said entered information and said determined geographical location. Osaku does not teach or suggest determining the geographical location and hence does not teach or suggest providing a page address responsive to a determined geographical location. The Examiner referred to the difference between the response given in Osaku to "patent search" and to "JAL". Applicant respectfully submits that this difference is

due to the content of the information and not the geographical location at which the information is entered or any other determined location, as Osaku does not teach or suggest determining a location. It is clear from Osaku that regardless of the location of input device 14 (Japan, Antarctica, Kansas city) the same response will be provided (col. 6, lines 33-39) to the same entered information. A discussion of this issue can be found in the present application on page 16.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by the virtue of their parent claim.

Applicants wish to point out that a PTO-1449 form was filed on August 10, 2004 together with a copy of the cited art. The form was never received in return initialed by the Examiner. Applicants are resubmitting the form and respectfully request that the references listed thereon be initialed by the Examiner. Applicants assume that the art has already been considered by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP 609.

In view of the above amendment, applicants respectfully await allowance of the claims. In the event that the Examiner finds any further problems, which would make it impossible to issue an allowance for all the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at 1 (877) 428-5468, which is a US toll free number connected directly to our office in Israel (please note the 7 hour time difference and the official work week is from Sunday to Thursday).

Respectfully submitted,
Aviv REFUAH et al.

Yaakov Schatz
Yaakov Schatz
Reg. No. 44,320

April 4, 2005

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650